Iris Feng

**Documentary Log**

**Title: Food Inc-Trailer**

**What do you see?**

**Visual**

-horses, cow, field, supermarket, chicken, small chicken, big chicken, ketchup, Peanut butter, price tag on food, food operation, people eating, organic, farm, scan on cow, President Bush, farmers, customers.

**Text**

1950 vs 2008; corn product, “killing” “sick” “made in Mexico, China, Argentina, Brazil” “POWER” “TABLES”, Food inc on cow

**What do you hear?**

**Narration, interview, voice over**

-47,000 products in supermarket

-faster, fatter, cheaper

-rearranged corn

-government made it against law to cultivated product

-make it legal to publish food production

-have nutrient dense food so no more sickness

**Background music/sounds**

Melancholy🡪fast beating/action🡪light-cowboy-country

**Tone**: conversational, casual, informal, sarcastic

**purpose/point**: Americans need healthy food and honesty from producers

**Ideas/images/sounds that are persuasive**:

**-statistics/facts**: logos, numbers and facts give the audience a honest idea of what is in the food, how it is made, and what has it done to Americans.

-**the carton of two size chicken**: visually shows that business people added stimulator to make bigger eggs in less time🡪make audience question about what goes in their mouth and its effect

**Questions**: We have the choice to decide whether or not to eat fast food or junk food. Would it be fair to file complaints to these companies because people can’t control their amount which results in obesity? We all know fries and burgers are not healthy, but some still eat them. Therefore who should be blamed?

**Conclusion:** The argument is somewhat effective because the use of numbers and visuals are show and imply about the unhealthy food consumed by Americans. Narrator’s tone is very informal which make the audience easier to accept the ideas. However, it would be more convincing if they show glimpse of actual processed food production so audience can judge on their own.